DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY

DEC 27 1961

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION & EDUCATION

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

THE VALUE-CHOICES OF COLLEGE SOPHOMORES — A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Co-editors:

Max R. Goodson

Theodore Brameld

Analysis by:

Albert J. Sullivan

Published by the

BOSTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

VOLUME 144 NUMBER 2 DECEMBER, 1961

EDITORIAL BOARD

THOMAS H. EAMES, *Editor*

J. FRED WEAVER, *Chairman*

DONALD D. DURRELL

WILLIAM C. KVARACEUS

LESLIE W. IRWIN

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
JOURNAL OF EDUCATION
Established 1875

VOLUME 144 DECEMBER, 1961 NUMBER 2

The Value-Choices of College Sophomores— A Comparative Study

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: Introduction. Max R. Goodson, Dean, and Theodore Brameld, Professor of Educational Philosophy . . . 3

CHAPTER II: The Value Choices of College Sophomores — A Co-operative Study. Analysis by Albert J. Sullivan . . . 6

CHAPTER III: Addenda 21

Published four times a year (October, December, February, and April) by Boston University School of Education, 332 Bay State Road, Boston 15, Massachusetts. Subscription price $3.00 a year; 2 years, $5.50. (In Canada $3.50 a year; foreign, $4.00 a year.) Single copies $1.00. Entered as second-class matter, Boston, Massachusetts, October 30, 1953. Change of address should be sent promptly giving both the old and the new address. Copyright, 1961, Trustees of Boston University. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

Since July, 1959, candidates for the Doctor of Education degree at Boston University have been required to take an "Advanced Seminar," which is described as follows:

> "An interdisciplinary approach to fundamental issues in education, utilizing frontier developments in the various disciplines related to education. Special concern given to the role of the educator in his culture. In addition to class sessions, students should plan on devoting substantial blocs of time to laboratory projects, field experiences, and intensive periods of group study and conference."

The rationale of the Seminar, as the editors of this issue of the *Journal* understand it, is that men and women who receive the Ed.D. degree are potential if not already actual leaders in education. As such, they should be prepared for their professional service in terms of both their specialized competencies and their comprehensive understanding of the role of education as a central agency of cultural transmission and innovation.

Traditionally, the former of these two kinds of preparation has often overshadowed the latter. Whatever general knowledge and cultural sophistication the Doctor of Education may have acquired has been assumed largely upon the basis of his earlier education, rather than upon the basis of any deliberate inclusion of this kind of study on the upper graduate level. In concentrating upon specialized areas, educational preparation at least on this level has thus tended to emulate other professions, such as medicine and law.

In adopting a policy to widen the graduate preparation of educational leaders, a majority of the faculty of the School of Education has indicated some disagreement with this conception. The educational leader, however specialized, is viewed also as properly concerned with the total community within which schools of all sorts operate. The Advanced Seminar, while it could not pretend to provide more than a limited degree of counterbalance to the continuing stress upon specialization, may be regarded as a step in the direction of the polaristic conception of the doctorate that we have implied.

In order that its generalizing role be consistently maintained, the Seminar has been planned thus far with the continuous involvement of the Department of the Foundations of Education. This Department is, of course, particularly responsible for providing educators in preparation with philosophical, historical, sociological, psychological, and comparable types of foundational knowledge upon which all professional practice rests. Therefore the faculty has delegated to the Foundations of Education a major coordinating and participating responsibility, and one member of the Department is regularly assigned to the Seminar as one of its two leaders. The other leader is drawn from a second Department, both of them serving as a team in regular, active attendance at all Seminar meetings.

Here it is necessary to clarify another facet of the overall rationale. As indicated in the description, the approach is "interdisciplinary." This means that the kind of problems appropriate to the Seminar cut across typical departmental or subject-matter lines. The approach means, further, that educational leaders should have at least one substantial opportunity (candidates are permitted to take two of the Seminars if their schedules permit) to discover how interwoven are the crucial problems of education — how, therefore, en-

rollees need to discover by dramatic, first-hand exposure why these problems require the combined competence of two or more experts from related fields. To achieve this objective, each Seminar is further expected to utilize as many additional resource persons as time and facilities permit.

It follows that no two Seminars could or should be merely repetitive. In order, however, to provide at least a broad common framework for all of them, the Foundations of Education staff has prepared a plan of sequential themes based upon the classical triadic branches of philosophy: value, reality, and knowledge. So far as available personnel permit, the aim is to offer at least one Seminar yearly in which the encompassing problem gravitates around one or another of these three branches. Thus far, two Seminars have been offered in different aspects of value (ethical and esthetic) in their significance for educational theory and practice; a second is scheduled for the second semester of 1961-62 on aspects of psychological reality for education; and a third is under preparation in "ways of knowing," which will focus upon epistemological problems of science in relation to education research. No specialized knowledge in the focal area is presupposed on the part of the enrolled students.

The first Seminar, on values in ethics and education, was given under the leadership of the undersigned. In accordance with the directives of the faculty, resource persons were brought into the Seminar at intervals; these included Professor Gordon Allport of Harvard University, Professor Abraham Maslow of Brandeis University, and Professors Kenneth D. Benne and Ralph Garry of Boston University. Several other faculty members attended individual sessions and offered helpful suggestions. As the following study shows, the Seminar was further assisted by the administration and faculty of the College of Basic Studies of Boston University.

Another directive of the faculty was that participants have opportunity for field experiences. These were provided in ways that are also described in the study below.

A prospectus of the first Seminar on Values, which the faculty considered before authorization, is herewith provided (with minor editorial change) as another way to characterize the underlying principles of this venture in doctoral preparation:

One seminar that could be given consideration under the new six-hour requirement for doctoral candidates would focus on the problem of values as it has been developing during the past several years through new types of interdisciplinary theory and research.

Historically, of course, this complex problem has been left largely to the philosophers, and more specifically to experts in ethics and esthetics. Psychologists and social scientists have either tried to ignore the problem or to insist that it lies outside the scope of their objective research. Gradually, however, a shift has been taking place: reference to values is heard more and more frequently even in laboratory and field studies, and some behavioral scientists such as anthropologists have begun to re-examine the whole issue in its relations to individual and cultural behavior.

In education, values have been paid somewhat greater attention than in the sciences of man, but here too the tendency has often been to skirt the problem or to treat it by means of clichés or platitudes. Here, too, however, a shift is taking place. Increasing restlessness among educations as to the goals of education is noticeable on every side. "Moral and spiritual values" have received attention by such bodies as the American Council on Education. The

pressure of organized religion upon public education has intensified concern: the schools are challenged to deal with values directly or to move over and let the churches come in to deal with them. The challenge of the iron curtain countries has also made us more sensitive to the question of whether our own goals and values are sufficiently powerful and clear to meet that challenge.

At least four different areas could be examined that are apropos of this problem:

1. The major viewpoints concerning values that are now advanced by theorists in the field, especially ethicists and estheticians.
2. Major types of research now taking place in the behavioral sciences, e.g., the Harvard Values Study Project which has worked in several cultures, such as the Navajo Indians, and which has already produced a body of rich material.
3. Value theory and research in the field of education itself.
4. Team studies of selected communities and schools to examine the implicit and explicit value patterns that prevail in them.

Examples of resources include the following:

1. Experts such as philosophers and behavioral scientists should be brought into the seminar.
2. Lay leaders who have articulate viewpoints concerning the role of the school in political, economic, moral, and religious affairs should be consulted by teams of seminar members.
3. Observations of classrooms, assemblies, extracurricular activities, etc., could be geared to the detection of implicit and explicit value patterns that operate in every school.
4. Observations could also be made of informal education activities for the detection of such patterns.

The objective of such a seminar would be to sensitize doctoral candidates to the pervasive problem of values in every area of education, with a view to achieving whatever consensuses are warranted by the evidence.

The study to which we now turn is a cooperative product throughout of both students and staff. We are especially grateful, however, to one of the Seminar students and our colleague, Professor Albert Sullivan of the School of Public Relations and Communications, for compiling the material in its present form. As he and we agree, weaknesses are, of course, abundant, and the objective mentioned was but imperfectly realized. Nevertheless, we are proud to share our efforts with a wider audience, not only to demonstrate how an interdisciplinary venture based upon the described rationale may be carried through, but also to encourage other graduate programs in education to improve upon our own beginnings. For their common aim, with ours, should be the development of the highest possible type of educational leaders through the richest possible program of doctoral studies.

MAX R. GOODSON
Dean

THEODORE BRAMELD
Professor of Educational Philosophy

THE VALUE-CHOICES OF COLLEGE SOPHOMORES — A COOPERATIVE STUDY

Analysis by
ALBERT J. SULLIVAN

The study of values is essential to education.

The values of young people are of particular importance. It might well be argued that a prime purpose of education is to develop a sound set of values in the young to undergird and guide their adult behavior.

This study investigated, in a preliminary and limited way, the value-orientations of a group of college students: what criteria guided their choices in a variety of situations demanding value-judgments; what pattern, if any, underlay their choices in different areas of value; and what sanctions gave authority to this value pattern.

Methods

Data were obtained during the spring of 1960 from 28 students in their second year of study at the College of Basic Studies, Boston University.[1] A structured depth interview with open-ended answers was used, designed in such a way as (1) to allow the respondent wide freedom to react to a situation involving a value-choice, and (2) to assist the interviewer in classifying responses in a systematic way.

The interviews were held away from the College of Basic Studies under informal auspices, usually in the home of the respondent or the interviewer. Respondents were guaranteed anonymity. These circumstances seemed to encourage a willing flow of information from respondents; several interviewers reported an almost embarrassing eagerness by the respondents to discuss their most intimate problems, difficulties, and weaknesses, and their most dearly-held aspirations. Interviews usually ran to two or more sessions; the shortest time taken to collect responses was over four hours per respondent; the longest, over ten hours per respondent.

The Interviewers — The method of collecting data involved discussion at some length, between interviewer and respondent, about the value-choices made. Such a method is correctly open to the charge that the interviewer's own ideas may be projected. In a study of values, it may be asked, "Were the interviewer's values projected? Did they perhaps color the responses? Were the replies what the respondent sensed the interviewer wanted to hear?"

These are fair questions, perhaps impossible to answer precisely. Certainly little is known yet about the measurement of human motivation, and the subtle effects which result from person-to-person communication. It is safest to say, then, that some bias, the amount and direction unknown, was introduced into this study because of the projection of the interviewer's own value-orientation.

Later, it will be noted how some correction for this bias was attempted by

[1] Thirty-two students took part in the survey. However, at the time of the analysis, reports on four of them were not available.

The College of Basic Studies (previously, Junior College) conducts a 2-year program in the humanities and liberal arts. Graduates who qualify academically may transfer to senior colleges for their bachelor's degree.

the design of the interview guide-instrument. It may be proper now, however, to touch upon the background of the interviewers; this background may be kept in mind in evaluating their findings.

The 15 interviewers[2] were all doctoral candidates in the Advanced Doctoral Seminar on Values, conducted by Dean Max Goodson and Professor Theodore Brameld, School of Education, Boston University. Their average age was somewhere near 40. A broad range of educational experience was represented in their backgrounds.

Five were teaching fellows in four different departments of the School of Education; four were instructors (physics, sociology, social science, public relations) in four different colleges — two being chairmen of their departments; three were teachers in secondary schools, one a principal; three were rehabilitation counselors in three different agencies, one the director of his department.

The purpose, design, and methodology of the study were developed cooperatively by both students and staff of the Seminar, one general aim of which is to bring educational theory to bear upon problems of educational practice.

The Respondents — With the cooperation of officials of the College of Basic Studies, two members of the Seminar were allowed to address an assembly of second-year students. There the purpose of the study was defined, the methods outlined, the safeguards to protect the participants' anonymity explained. Over 80 members of the class volunteered; 32 of these were selected for interviewing because they happened to live near the community of the interviewers; none of them was known personally to the interviewers.

The number of respondents chosen was based on the time available for the lengthy interview process; it was hoped that sufficient data for the purposes of this pilot study would become available from a sample of this size. The selection was sufficiently random, also, so that if a pattern did emerge it might become a basis for a more rigorously designed study.

The 28 respondents consisted of 16 young men and 12 young women, whose average age was slightly over 19 years — one was 17, one 18, one 25; the others ranged from 19 to 21.

The median college grade attained by the entire group over three semesters, was "C" — the girls averaging "B—," the boys "C+." The high school average of the group was about "C."

The families of the members of the group all lived in the Northeast: 18 in New England (8 in Greater Boston, 16 in Massachusetts), 8 in New York, 1 in New Jersey, 1 in Pennsylvania. In terms of community size, 9 families lived in cities, 11 in suburbs, 8 in small towns.

Religious affiliations were recorded as Protestant 9, Jewish 8, Catholic 7, Orthodox 1, none or not given 3.

Economic status of the families of the group might be classified, in Warner's terms, as ranging from middle class to lower-middle class. The profile below, which includes the father's occupation, seems to justify this classification. It also suggests certain other characteristics of the group.

---

[2] Members of the Seminar included: Grace Callahan, Paul Congdon, Charles Crowley, George Donald, Frank Eldridge, Marjorie Emeneau, William Hart, Katherine Hume, Albert Kahn, Harold Kearney, Carol Morganstern, Evelyn Robinson, Albert Sullivan, Roy Woods, Jeannette Wright. (Data from Kearney and Donald were not submitted.)

1. Virtually all of the occupational plans of the respondents depend on further education beyond the two years of Basic Studies, but it is the general policy of the college not to recommend transfer for students in the C range. Evidently half of the group, at least, will have difficulty in advancing academically.

2. Seven of the group chose careers which seem to follow in their father's footsteps; six of these are young men, only one a young woman. Very few choices are in demanding disciplines requiring many more years of study (viz., ornithologist, dentist, lawyer, archaeologist, college professor). Perhaps some of these were selected as "glamorous" occupations, rather than as serious career choices; the same suggestion may be made of choices like movie director, airline stewardess, diplomatic service.

3. Ten of the group's choices of career plan might be classified as signifying aspirations for upward social mobility.

The Guide-Instrument — Each interviewer used a form consisting of 50 choice-situations which served as a "guide" during the depth interview. This form, however, was also arranged so that responses could be classified into four value categories. It is reproduced below.

The 50 "choice-situations" on the interviewer's guide-instrument were divided among five different areas of life experience in which values are constantly operative: Employment and Economic; Class and Race; Leisure; Dating, Marriage and Sex; and Social. Ten "choice-situations" were devised for each of these areas.

The 50 items in the guide-instrument were developed in the following fashion:

Each member of the Seminar proposed three to five situations which demanded a choice of values; he tested these "situations" on three to six young men and women, reported their reactions to the "situations" to a sub-committee of the Seminar.

This sub-committee screened the proposed items, rejecting those which were ambiguous, trivial, or not obviously assignable to the five areas of life experience previously decided upon.

The value-choices were divided into four categories, thus: "Self-realization" choice; "Status" choice; "Social" choice; "Other." For example, item 1 in the Employment area reads:

"You have just graduated from college. Your family wants you to enter the family-owned manufacturing business where you can expect assured success and rich monetary rewards. You have already accepted employment in relief work with the United Nations in Asia. What would you do?

1. (*Self-realization Choice*) Accept the United Nations job because it is what you want to do?
2. (*Status Choice*) Go into the family business?
3. (*Social Choice*) Accept the United Nations job because by giving of your services overseas you can promote world peace?
4. *Other.*"

Occupational Plans Compared with Parent's Occupation[1]

Male

Occupational Plan	*Parent's Position*	*Probably Same As Parent*	*Aspiration for Upward Social Mobility*
Funeral Dir.	Funeral Dir.	*	
Labor Relations	Union Official	*	
Indust. P.R.	Industrial P.R.	*	
"Psychology" or Music	Club Mgr. and Musician	*	*
Acc'ting-P.R.	Bank Examiner	*	
Teaching	Real Estate, Ins.		
"Boats, Autos"	Manufacturer		
Movie Dir.	Lawyer		
Teaching	Machinist		*
Radio Station Mgr.	Court Clerk		*
IBM Programming — Sales	Lawyer ("unsuccessful")		
Politics	Prop., Pkg. Store		*
Dentist	Dentist	*	
Ornithologist	Millwright		*
Coll. Teacher	Newspaper Editor		

Female

Occupational Plan	*Parent's Position*	*Probably Same As Parent*	*Aspiration for Upward Social Mobility*
Teacher	Retired Garment Trade		*
Teacher	Exec. Paper Industry		
Dramatics	Outdoor Ad-Man		
Statistical Research	Electronics Inspector		*
Diplomatic Service	Prop., Meat Store		*
Airline Stewardess	Trucker		
Teacher	Retired		*
Journalism	Real Estate Op.		
Teacher	Machinist		*
Archaeology	Manager		*
Lawyer	Lawyer	*	

1. Data not supplied for one male, one female, of group of 28 subjects.

The wording in the three value-choices was carefully scrutinized by this method: each "choice" was read aloud in the Seminar without signification as "self," "status," "social"; each member classified it; only "choices" which were unanimously assigned to the proper category were accepted for use in the interview; all of the 150 "choice" wordings which were used as items passed this test. (The value-choices indicated in parentheses above were not, of course, revealed to the respondent but were known to the interviewer.)

The "Choice-Categories" — The categories of choice — "self," "status," "social" — were developed in an attempt to determine, however grossly, the main orientation of the value-orientations held by a group of modern young people.

From a wide reading list (see below) three books, particularly, proved fruitful for purposes of this study:

The Values of Future Teachers, by Fay Corey, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., 1955

The Failure of Success, by Esther Milner, Exposition Press, New York, 1960

New Knowledge of Human Values, edited by Abraham Maslow, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1960

Miss Corey's book, based on a study made of students in schools of education, described values in traditionally social terms: choices were evaluated according to democratic, social-justice criteria — what were described in Seminar discussions as "copy-book maxims." Samples of items in the instrument used by Miss Corey suggest this "social" orientation:

Item 5: I believe we have a moral responsibility to protect the freedom and basic rights of a country threatened by aggressors.

Item 14: I wouldn't hesitate to take a towel as a souvenir from a hotel in which I stayed.

Item 36: I believe if we could provide the proper facilities and careful guidance, a far greater number of criminals and delinquents would become useful citizens again.

Miss Milner's book stressed the status values that are so strong in contemporary American culture — especially those associated with materialistic success.

Mr. Maslow focused upon the importance of self-realization; of making value-choices in line with what will best develop one's own creative potential, one's own personality.

Thus, the choice-categories took on definition. Would a group of modern young people faced with value-situations choose according to an orientation that was oriented to traditionally "social" rules of conduct? Or one which was based on motives of success "status"? Or one which sought "self-realization" and fulfillment of individual potential? Or for some other reason than these?

Sources of the Value-Orientation — Early in Seminar discussions, it became evident that confusion could arise between "sanction" and "source." The "sanction" authorizes the value-orientation to operate in a given situation — to make this rather than that choice. The "source" describes whence the sanction arose.

"Sources," it was agreed, included (1) "authority figures" such as parent, teacher, clergyman, official; (2) peers; (3) environmental forces too diffuse and "cultural" to be specified but certainly outside the personality of the "valuer"; and (4) the internalized judgment of the valuer, who may have derived his choice-mechanism from any of the other three "sources," but does not follow them blindly because he has decided on their virtue for himself.

One problem was how to distinguish, in any given situation, between autonomous sanctions (i.e., internalized judgments of the respondent) and sanctions which were from outside, particularly from "authority figures" and peers. It was decided to probe, after each situation-choice was made in the interview, for the *sanction* of each choice, and to distinguish it as carefully as possible from mere *source*. The guide-instrument, therefore, does not show this dimension of the depth-interview. However, the tabulation of findings does reflect this probing for sanctions under the headings "self," "authority," "peer."

These terms — self, authority, peer — report, in the interviewer's judgment, where the sanction for each choice was anchored. Two things should be borne in mind, however:

1. Although the original "source" of the value-judgment may have been authority or peer, if the respondent persuaded the interviewer of the internalization of the judgment (i.e., he had considered the meaning of the judgment and accepted it freely as the correct one) the "sanction" is labeled "self."

2. It is probably impossible, by verbal interchange alone, to determine with complete certainty what either source or sanction may be in a particular respondent's reaction to any particular item.

The Interview Process — It was desired that the respondent should have as much freedom as possible to make his choice; forced choices were not wanted. Hence, the "situation" in the guide-instrument was given to him in the interviewer's own language, rather than read. He was asked to make a decision *before* the various categories of choices were put before him. If his answer was clear-cut, and obviously classifiable, the four categories were not necessarily gone through at all. However, the various choices were brought out by probe-questions in the discussion and he was permitted to change his mind if further consideration demanded it. The classification of his response, therefore, was made only after mutual deliberation and some discussion of alternatives.

It should be noted that some situations (for the most part in the area, Class and Race) fell outside the respondent's experience. He might say, "I've never faced anything like that — I don't know for sure just what I would do." In such cases, the interviewer sought the likeliest answer, but the validity of such responses was accordingly reduced.

After the response to the situation was classified satisfactorily according to the four categories, the interviewer sought to specify the sanction — self, authority, peer. If necessary, this was discussed; sometimes in the course of the interchange the sanction was brought out quite clearly and needed no further clarification.

An example: one respondent, asked about her reaction to following a certain career over objections of family and friends (Employment, Item 4) replied that she *had* this situation now, and was going ahead regardless of

"authority" and "peers." Further, she disagreed with friends who were "giving in." The sanction here — self — seemed clear-cut, without further discussion.

Actually, many of the "Other" responses were closely related to one or another of the first three value-choices. However, since they represented such a small part of the total responses — 10.1% — it was decided to let them stand. Also, it was felt that leaving the "Other" column would emphasize the open-endedness of the questions in the study.

Findings of the Study

With 28 subjects reacting to 50 value-situations each, there is a total of 1400 responses tabulated in the following section. These responses have been classified, for purposes of analysis, according to:

Areas of life experience: Employment and Economic; Race and Class; Leisure; Dating, Marriage and Sex; and Social

Sex of respondents

Category of value-choice: Social, Self-realization, Status, Other

Sanction: Self, Authority, Peers

The unit of tabulation was "one"; the response assigned to the category of value-choice was given this value. Within the category, it was sometimes difficult for the interviewer to distinguish the sanction; when there was doubt whether one or another sanction was the more powerful, he reported ½ for one sanction, ½ for a second sanction. For example, a respondent might have given a reply that was clearly a "status" choice, but probing disclosed that he was not clear whether he made his choice because he was convinced of its virtue, or because his peers were influencing him. Therefore, the response would have been tabulated in the Status column, ½ Self, ½ Peers. No further division was needed, beyond halving, because the difficulty of assignment always arose between two sanctions, viz. peers vs. self, or self vs. authority, or authority vs. peers.

Some Notes on Findings

Perhaps the most unexpected finding is the relatively low percentage of responses in the "Status" category — 17.8% (see Table 1). Milner, in *Failure of Success,* and other writers deploring the materialistic viewpoint, suggest that status values are more prominent than this for American culture as a whole.

It is also provocative that "Self-realization" values have the highest score — 40.5% of all responses; that self-internalized sanctions (72.4% of all responses) are more powerful by 2½ times than the sanctions of authority and peers put together (19.5% plus 8.1%); and that the females are even more strongly oriented to self-realization than the males (46.1% vs. 36.3%), and motivated more by self-internalized sanctions (78.1% vs. 68.1%).

TABLE 1 — We have already remarked the more obvious relationships disclosed by this table: the small percentage of responses in the "Other" category, 10.1%; the small percentage in the "Status" category, 17.8%; the largest percentage under "Self-realization," 40.5%, of all the categories of choice; and the heavy assignment under the "Self" sanction, 72.4%.

TABLE 1. VALUE CHOICES: SOCIAL, SELF-REALIZATION, STATUS BY SANCTION AND SEX

	Social				*Self-Realization*				*Status*				*Other*				*Totals*			
	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	
Male	138	88	25½	251½	248	32½	10	290½	98	40½	33	171½	60½	16	10	86½	544½	177	78½	800
Female	144½	37	9	190½	240½	26½	9½	276½	43	19	16	78	40½	13½	1	55	468½	96	35½	600
Totals	282½	125	34½	442	488½	59	19½	567	141	59½	49	249½	101	29½	11	141½	1013	273	114	1400
% of Totals	20.2	9.0	2.4	31.6%	34.9	4.2	1.4	40.5%	10.0	4.3	3.5	17.8%	7.2	2.1	0.8	10.1%	72.4	19.5	8.1	100%

S = Self-Internalized; A = Authority figure; P = Peers.
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding-off errors.

Certain other relationships might be worth noting:

1. The "Self-realization" category is almost 2½ times larger than the "Status" category, 40.5% vs. 17.8%. If this represents a true picture, then this group of young people, at least in Maslow's terms of the healthy personality, are better oriented than might have been thought.

2. The "Social" category, with its orientation to democratic and societal values runs a close second — 31.6% — to "Self-realization." We might describe these "Social" values as those demanded for the good life in community with our fellows; we might describe "Self-realization" values as those demanded by our own self-respect.

If we accept these definitions, and add the scores in these two categories, 40.5% plus 31.6% or 72.1% — we find that this group of students, at least, insists that its value choices would be guided 4 to 1 (72.1% vs. 17.8%) by "healthy" criteria over "unhealthy" criteria. Or put another way, 80% of its value-choices would be oriented soundly, and 20% would be "materialistic."

If there is any validity to these findings, this relationship alone is so provocative that it should be tested further.

3. The "Self" sanction runs 3½ times higher than "Authority" and 9 times higher than "Peers" (72.4% vs. 19.5% vs. 8.1%). Perhaps we should not be too surprised at this insistence by 19-year-olds on "I make my own decisions." Determination to be an individual may be characteristic of American adolescence and post-adolescence.

Possibly it is more unusual that "Authority" still carries some influence; and that this influence is well over twice what can be claimed by "Peers." Said another way, "Authority" sanctions 1 out of 5 decisions (19.5% vs. 100%); "Peers" sanction 1 out of 12 decisions (8.1% vs. 100%).

4. Within each value category, the "Self" sanction leads always. But notice that in the "Self-realization" category, it is 9 times larger than "Authority" (34.9% vs. 4.2%), 25 times larger than "Peers" (34.9% vs. 1.4%), and over 6 times larger than both combined (34.9% vs. 5.6%). Because of the overlap in meaning between "Self-realization" and "Self-internalization," something of this sort might have been expected. But the ratios — 9 times, and 25 times, and 6 times — are strikingly large.

5. Under "Authority," 9% of the responses fell into the "Social" category; this is almost one-third of the responses under "Social" (31.6% vs. 9%), and almost one-half of all the responses assigned to "Authority" (19.5% vs. 9.0%). This suggests that where decisions are made following "best-for-the-community" criteria, this group, at least, seems strongly influenced by its elders.

6. Finally, "Peer" totals run low in all categories — 2.4%, 1.4%, 3.5%, 0.8%. This internal consistency suggests that "Peers" might not be as influential as some writers insist.

TABLE 2 — This table classifies all responses by areas of life experience. The pattern seems clear, as noted above — strong emphasis on the self sanction, weak emphasis on "authority," minimal emphasis on "peers."

Another pattern of values emerges when we arrange the responses under the categories "Social" and "Self-realization" in the order of percentage size:

TABLE 2. CLASSIFICATION OF VALUE-CHOICES BY AREAS OF LIFE EXPERIENCE: MALE PLUS FEMALE

Life Experience Areas	*Social*				*Self-Realization*				*Status*				*Other*				*Totals*			
	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	
1. Emp. & Econ.	28½	18	0	46½	137	17	2½	156½	42½	21½	4	68	7	2	0	9	215	58½	6½	280
% of Sub-totals				16.6%				55.9%				24.3%				3.2%				100%
2. Class & Race	74	36	6	116	67½	10½	3	81	17½	21	9½	48	24	9	2	35	183	76½	20½	280
% of Sub-totals				41.4%				28.9%				17.1%				12.5%				100%
3. Leisure	58	17	8½	83½	110	9	2½	121½	19	4½	16	39½	29½	4	2	35½	216½	34½	29	280
% of Sub-totals				29.8%				43.4%				14.1%				12.7%				100%
4. Dat., Marr., & Sex	48	25	4	77	100½	9½	5	115	33	8½	9½	51	24½	10½	2	37	206	53½	20½	280
% of Sub-totals				27.5%				41.0%				18.2%				13.2%				100%
5. Social	74	29	16	119	73½	13	6½	93	29	4	10	43	16	4	5	25	192½	50	37½	280
% of Sub-totals				42.5%				33.2%				15.3%				8.9%				100%
Totals	282½	125	34½	442	488½	59	19½	567	141	59½	49	249½	101	29½	11	141½	1013	273	114	1400
% of Totals	20.2	9.0	2.4	31.6%	34.9	4.2	1.4	40.5%	10.0	4.3	3.5	17.8%	7.2	2.1	0.8	10.1%	72.4	19.5	8.1	100%

Social		*Self-Realization*	
Social	42.5%	Emp. and Eco.	55.9%
Class and Race	41.4%	Leisure	43.4%
Leisure	29.8%	D.M. and S.	41.0%
D.M. and S.	27.5%	Social	33.2%
Emp.-Eco.	16.6%	Class and Race	28.9%

First, there are three distinct groupings: the areas of Social and Class and Race are so close in percentage that it may be said they vary only by chance. The same is true of Leisure and Dating, Marriage and Sex as a grouping. Employment and Economics as a grouping is well away in both cases.

Second, these three groupings are exactly reversed between the two value-choice categories.

In the "Social" category — where traditional community values are paramount — the areas of Social and Class and Race drew the heaviest response: about 42% of all responses. In the "Self-realization" category — where personality fulfillment is paramount — these areas drew the lightest response: about 30%.

A possible explanation may be offered. The Social area calls for value-judgments in the social amenities, in getting along with one's fellows. Cultural rules of behavior are bred into one's bones and are quite convenient as bases for value-choice. The Class and Race area, on the other hand, is more confused. Cultural groups are in literally violent conflict, and for this set of respondents, with admittedly little personal experience in the area, it was perhaps safer to follow traditional democratic principles rather than their own internalized judgments.

Contrariwise, the area of Employment and Economics is high in "Self-realization" values, low in "Social" values. Indeed, the 55.9% of the responses in this area under "Self-realization" is the highest percentage in the table. The 16.6% in this area under "Social" is so low that even "Status" (24.3%) draws substantially more responses (the only time "Status" leads either of the other two categories, it might be noted).

Since this area touches the respondents' careers, and perhaps more than any other involves upward social mobility, it is not surprising that "Self-realization" — and "Status", for that matter — play such an important role in their value-orientation.

The third grouping — Leisure, and Dating, Marriage and Sex — stands in the middle of both rankings. It is perhaps natural that these areas fall together: leisure activities generally involve fellowship at this age, and one aspect of fellowship (if we may express it this way) concerns relationships with the opposite sex. In the "Social" category, this grouping draws about 28% of the responses; in the "Self-realization" category, it draws about 42%. Both figures may be significant; but perhaps the difference between them is most significant: self-values are half again as prominent as social-values in determining conduct in leisure and dating activities.

TABLES 3 and 4 — We may point out some provocative comparisons in these tables:

1. The young men placed 36.3% of their responses in the "Self-realization" category; but the young women placed 46.1% of their responses here. This is an increase of almost a third. Are young women so much more guided by self-internalized values?
2. The young men placed 21.5% of their responses in the "Status" category; the young women placed only 13% of theirs here — a decrease of more than a third. Are young men so much more guided by "materialistic" values?
3. Referring to sanctions: the young men followed "self" 68.1% of the time; but the young women claimed "self" for sanction 78.1% of the time. Are young women significantly more independent in judgment?

Summary and Evaluation

The Positive Side — These data disclose a pattern of value-choices by young people which may be epitomized as a strong orientation toward self-realization and traditional social values, with only weak orientation toward status values. The sanction behind these value-choices is predominantly self-internalized.

A strong internal consistency in patterns of responses is discernible. The method of interviewing, moreover, provided some opportunity for discussion of implications and consequences when value-choices were made. Choices could be changed or modified by respondents. The patterns are accordingly strengthened. Indeed, the level of confidence inspired by these interviews was rated "high" by the interviewers themselves. On a scale of 1 (very high) to 5 (very low), the median average was 2.3.

At the least, this study would seem to justify further research in two directions:

1. To verify, if true, the low value seemingly placed on status considerations — this, in the light of the welter of material accusing Americans of the middle-class of being particularly status-minded;
2. To verify, if true, the weak sanction of peers — this, in the light of recent research, stressing the influence of his peers over the young American.

The Negative Side — The data were derived from verbal interchange only. Perhaps a study of overt behavior in situations of value-choice would sometimes contradict what the respondents said they would do if they were faced with such situations.

Research in values calls for more objective methods than this study reveals. Even the most impersonal interviewer projects his attitudes; even the most insensitive respondent may reflect concepts rather than generate them.

The sample was very small, drawn from a narrow segment of American life. Its source, a junior college, may not even be typical of American undergraduates generally.

The "guide-instrument" itself, although it was designed to measure values over several areas, may not always measure what it proposes to measure. Furthermore, it is not known whether a re-test would repeat the findings; the

TABLE 3. CLASSIFICATION OF VALUE-CHOICES BY AREAS OF VALUE: MALE

Areas of Life Experience	*Social*				*Self-Realization*				*Status*				*Other*				*Totals*			
	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	
1. Emp. & Econ.	16½	13	0	29½	69	10	1½	80½	28½	12½	3	44	5	1	0	6	119	36½	4½	160
2. Class & Race	33½	29	6	68½	32½	3	2	37½	12	18	5	35	13	5	1	19	91	55	14	160
3. Leisure	31½	14	5	50½	57½	3	1	61½	9	3½	14	26½	18½	1	2	21½	116½	21½	22	160
4. Dat., Marr., & Sex	25	15½	2	42½	50½	7½	1½	59½	27	6½	4½	38	13	5	2	20	115½	34½	10	160
5. Social	31½	16½	12½	60½	38½	9	4	51½	21½	0	6½	28	11	4	5	20	102½	29½	28	160
Totals	138	88	25½	251½	248	32½	10	290½	98	40½	33	171½	60½	16	10	86½	544½	177	78½	800
% of Totals	17.2	11.0	3.2	31.4%	31.0	4.0	1.3	36.3%	12.3	5.1	4.1	21.5%	7.6	2.0	1.2	10.8%	68.1	22.1	9.8	100%

TABLE 4. CLASSIFICATION OF VALUE-CHOICES BY AREAS OF LIFE EXPERIENCE: FEMALE

	Social				*Self-Realization*				*Status*				*Other*				*Totals*			
	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	*Sub-totals*	S	A	P	
1. Emp. & Econ.	12	5	0	17	68	7	1	76	14	9	1	24	2	1	0	3	96	22	2	120
2. Class & Race	40½	7	0	47½	35	7½	1	43½	5½	3	4½	13	11	4	1	16	92	21½	6½	120
3. Leisure	26½	3	3½	33	52½	6	1½	60	10	1	2	13	11	3	0	14	100	13	7	120
4. Dat., Marr., & Sex	23	9½	2	34½	50	2	3½	55½	6	2	5	13	11½	5½	0	17	90½	19	10½	120
5. Social	42½	12½	3½	58½	35	4	2½	41½	7½	4	3½	15	5	0	0	5	90	20½	9½	120
Totals	144½	37	9	190½	240½	26½	9½	276½	43	19	16	78	40½	13½	1	55	468½	96	35½	600
% of Totals	24.1	6.2	1.5	31.8%	40.1	4.4	1.6	46.1%	7.2	3.1	2.7	13.0%	6.8	2.2	0.1	9.1%	78.1	16.0	5.9	100%

reliability may be open to question, despite the strong internal consistency of the responses.

The Balance — This study is merely a pilot study, with full recognition of opportunity for bias. The criticisms regarding validity, reliability, and statistical rigor should be noted. No generalizations beyond those offered are legitimate.

All that has been intended is to uncover, if it exists, a pattern of values among a segment of college undergraduates. Given this pattern, validating experiments, designed with scientific care, should follow.

The practical and vital implications of such experiments could be almost infinite. The strengths and weaknesses of American culture in general, and of its chief formal enculturative agent (education) in particular, are in large degree gauged by the strengths and weaknesses of the value-orientations believed in and enacted by its citizens.

ADDENDA

I. *Selected Bibliography* (utilized by Seminar members)

Allport, Gordon W. and Vernon, P. E., *Study of Values.*

Benne, K., Axtelle, G., Raup, B., and Smith, B., *Improvement of Practical Intelligence.*

Berkson, I. B., *The Ideal and the Community.*

Bode, Boyd, *Democracy as a Way of Life.*

Brameld, T., *Toward a Reconstructed Philosophy of Education.*

Brubacher, J. D. (Ed.), *The Public Schools and Spiritual Values.*

Cassirer, Ernst, *An Essay on Man.*

Chalmers, Gordon R., *The Republic and the Person.*

Childs, John L., *Morals and Education.*

Collier, K. G., *The Social Purposes of Education.*

Corey, Fay L., *Values of Future Teachers.*

Curti, Merle, *Social Ideas of American Educators.*

Dahlke, H. Otto, *Values in Culture and Classroom.*

D'Arcy, Martin S. J., *History and Meaning of Love in the Western World.*

deChardin, Pierre T., *The Phenomenon of Man.*

Dewey, John, *Human Nature and Conduct.*

Edel, Abraham, *Ethical Judgment.*

Educational Policies Commission, *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools.*

Frank, Lawrence K., *The School as Agent of Cultural Renewal.*

Fromm, Erich, *Man for Himself, Ethics and Religion, Sane Society, Art of Loving, Escape from Freedom.*

Hart, Joseph K., *Education in the Humane Community.*

Hartford, Ellis F., *Moral Values in Public Education.*

Jaeger, Werner, *Paideia, The Ideals of Greek Culture.*

Malinowski, B., *Freedom and Civilization.*

Maritain, Jacques, *Education at the Crossroads.*

Maslow, Abraham (Ed.), *New Knowledge of Human Values.*

Meiklejohn, A., *Education Between Two Worlds.*

Milner, Esther, *Failure of Success.*

Muelder, W. G., *Foundations of a Responsible Society.*

Morris, Charles, *Paths of Life.*

Mumford, Lewis, *The Conduct of Life.*

Myrdal, Gunnar, *Values in Social Theory.*

National Society for Study of Education, *Modern Philosophies and Education.*

Otto, Max C., *Science and the Moral Life.*

Perry, Ralph Barton, *Realms of Value.*

Riesman, David, *The Lonely Crowd, Individualism Reconsidered.*

Russell, Bertrand, *New Hopes for a Changing World.*

Schuster, George N., *Education and Moral Wisdom.*

Smith, T. V., and Lindeman, E. C., *The Democratic Way of Life.*

Stevenson, *Ethics and Nature.*

Ulich, Robert, *The Human Career.*

Whyte, L. L., *The Next Development in Man.*

Woods, Frances J., *Cultural Values of American Ethnic Groups.*

II. *Interview "Guide-Instrument"* (See discussion of "Interview Process" above)

I. *Career: Problems of Employment and Economics*

1. You have just graduated from college. Your family wants you to enter the family-owned manufacturing business where you can expect assured success and rich monetary rewards. You have already accepted employment in relief work with the United Nations in Asia. What would you do?
   (1) Accept the United Nations job because it is what you want to do?
   (2) Go into the family business?
   (3) Accept the United Nations job because by giving of your services overseas you can promote world peace?

2. You have studied psychology all through college and graduate school. You now possess a brand new Ph.D. in the field and are looking for a job. You are intensely interested in the field and realize that in spite of your knowledge and competency in it, you and other psychologists have much to learn about the workings of the human mind. What kind of job would you look for?
   (1) Take a job as an industrial psychologist where you would expend all of your efforts in the interest of the company if they offered a higher salary than you could possibly expect elsewhere?
   (2) Take a lower paying position doing research and study under one of the greatest psychologists of our time?
   (3) Take an equally low-paying postion helping people in a mental hospital through psychotherapy?

3. A young friend of yours in the third year of college asks your advice. He loves carpentry and would rather work with wood than with anything else. His mother wants him to enter the family firm, an old, established, and wealthy brewery, when he graduates and to eventually take it over. He hates the idea and wants to be a carpenter. What should he do?
   (1) Become a carpenter because this is what he really wants?
   (2) Forget the idea (except, perhaps as a hobby) and enter the family business where he will make $25,000 a year as against $5,000 a year in carpentry?
   (3) Become a carpenter because he feels that houses, which he will be making, are more needed now by society than beer?

4. You want to be a teacher but everyone, your fiance, your parents, and your friends tell you that you are foolish — that you will "starve." You have been offered an excellent business job upon graduation, one starting at $5,000 a year and eventually leading to a much higher salary What would you do?
   (1) Become a teacher because it is what you really want to do?
   (2) Choose the business career?
   (3) Become a teacher where you can help youth to find its talents and potentialities?

5. A man finds himself in competition with an old friend for a promotion in his company which includes a considerable raise in pay. He is confident of obtaining the job if he reveals some practices directly against company policy employed by the friend. What should he do?

(1) Keep quiet about it and depend upon his own good work to win him the job?
(2) Tell the company and assure himself of the job?
(3) Go to the friend, tell him about this knowledge, and give him a chance to make amends and turn over a new leaf?

6. Mike's father is a doctor. Ever since Mike was a young boy his family planned on his going into medicine like his father. Mike, however, wants to become an engineer. His father says that if Mike studies engineering he will not help him financially through college. What would you do if you were Mike?
   (1) Study medicine because your family will stand behind you?
   (2) Study medicine because it will offer you opportunity to aid humanity?
   (3) Study engineering, your own real choice?

7. Assume that you are offered a position in some field not related to your special talents and are offered a very high salary for this job. What would you do?
   (1) Take the job because of the high salary?
   (2) Take a job rather in the field where your interests and abilities lie?
   (3) Determine which job would contribute the most to society and make this your choice?

8. You have done well scholastically in preparation to be a high school science teacher. This has been your ambition for some time. A private company offers you a technical job for which you are fitted by your science ability. The job offers you more pay, security, fringe benefits, and, by some standards, prestige, than you can expect from teaching. What do you do?
   (1) Take the job with the private company?
   (2) Go into teaching because it will give you more personal satisfaction?
   (3) Go into teaching because it is such a necessary career today?

9. You have graduated from college as an engineer. You have the opportunity to work for two good concerns. What would you consider in making a choice?
   (1) Work for the company which pays the most?
   (2) Work for the company which gave you the chance to learn more about your field and to contribute to knowledge through research work?
   (3) Work for the company which treats all of its employees with the greatest respect, conferring with all of them and considering all of them equals?

10. You are employed at a job with which you have been reasonably successful in terms of promotions, income, status, etc., but you are increasingly aware that you do not get much satisfaction from the work. What do you do?
   (1) Continue on the job because you and your family have become used to the way of life which it brings to you?

(2) Look for and take a job which will bring you more satisfaction even though the pay is considerably lower?
(3) Discuss the situation with your family and together arrive at a decision?

II. *Class and Race Situations*

1. You have just bought a new home and have not yet moved in. A rumor is spreading that a Negro family has moved into the house next door. What will you do?
   (1) Treat them as any other family and move into your new home?
   (2) Move in and try to gain personal growth through friendship with a different race?
   (3) Sell the house, look for another in a different neighborhood that is more restricted because you fear loss of status?
2. One of your Negro friends asks you to picket Woolworth's with him. What do you do?
   (1) You picket as a means of expressing the friendship you value highly, without regard to social issues.
   (2) You refuse because you fear your other friends would ridicule you.
   (3) You picket with your friend because you think civil rights, in general, are intensely important.
3. Paul Robeson, the famous Negro baritone, has been prevented from singing in the United States because of his openly pro-Communist activities. Would you:
   (1) Support a group who wanted him to sing in your community, on the ground that his political views should have nothing to do with his artistic creativity?
   (2) Support a Chamber of Commerce which said that Paul Robeson's appearance could hurt business in the community because he is a Negro as well as a Communist?
   (3) Support action to see that Robeson's rights are protected regardless of his political views. Allow him to sing; allow people to decide for themselves whether or not to attend.
4. If you, as a middle-class person, fell in love with a person from another race would you:
   (1) Refuse to marry him (her) because your reputation as a respected member of the community would be injured?
   (2) Marry him (her) if you loved him (her) enough because you believe that love comes first?
   (3) Marry him because you believe all races are equal?
5. One of your classmates is a Negro that you have grown to like and respect very much. A very popular club in which you hold membership brings you before its executive committee and tells you to break off your association with this Negro or resign from the club. What would you do?
   (1) Stop associating with the Negro as the club membership comprises a source of valuable business and social contacts?
   (2) Resign from the club because of its undemocratic practice?

(3) Resign from the club because you will not allow anyone to tell you who your friends shall be?

6. If you were attending a school that had always been restricted to white population, and suddenly found the administration had decided to open registration to non-white races, what would you do?
   (1) Welcome the change because you feel mixing with all ethnic groups will add to your personal growth?
   (2) Remain in the school because you feel that the school should have no restriction based on creed, race, or color?
   (3) Leave the school because you fear the infiltration might bring in too many lower-class students?

7. Your parents complain about your choice of companions whom they consider "lower class." What do you do?
   (1) You explain to your parents that you have chosen your friends because of certain traits and interests which are not restricted to any one socio-economic class; that you feel there is worth in all individuals in every walk of life.
   (2) The long term, personal, satisfying stimulating relationships with the friends you have chosen are reason enough for your choices. You retain them.
   (3) You reluctantly begin seeking new friends among "your own class of people" as you have to admit the practicality of protecting your status.

8. Your fraternity (sorority) has now a law about its membership as to race, but there are no Negroes in your organization. One of your members recommends an outstanding Negro student. With his qualifications, if he were White, there would be no question about his membership. What would you do?
   (1) Vote against the Negro because he wouldn't fit?
   (2) Vote for the Negro because you believe in being fair to all?
   (3) Vote for the Negro because he will help you understand him and therefore yourself?

9. A famous Negro athlete has been assigned as your roommate in a B. U. dormitory. Would you like the idea because:
   (1) He is a famous athlete and you would like to be known by your fellow students as his friend?
   (2) You would like to learn all you can about the thinking, ideas, etc. of a member of another race and thus become more mature yourself?
   (3) You feel he has the right to be assigned any room regardless of his race?

10. You are offered an opportunity to choose among the following three types of institutions. Which:
   (1) The "ivy league" college because you meet people who are likely to be influential leaders?
   (2) The city college because it is a democratic institution?
   (3) The university because the intellectual quality is likely to be more stimulating to your personal growth?

III. *Leisure Time*

1. You like outdoor winter sports. Your town and school are basketball crazy. How do you spend most of that part of your leisure that is devoted to sports?
   (1) Watching or playing basketball since I would be considered square otherwise?
   (2) Playing basketball, thereby contributing to community goals?
   (3) Winter sports because that is what I enjoy?

2. You are studying engineering in college and devoting a good deal of time to it. You are asked to be a leader in the local Boys Club, an activity which will take up much of your spare time. What would you do?
   (1) Reject the offer because it will not contribute in the least to the success of your engineering career?
   (2) Accept the offer because it will give you an opportunity to apply your talents and energy in another challenging direction?
   (3) Accept the offer because it means that you will be adding your contribution to serving the community and youth?

3. You like to read in your spare time. Your friends call you a bookworm and urge you to do other things with them. What do you do?
   (1) You read in most of your spare time because of its lasting satisfactions.
   (2) You reluctantly allow yourself to be weaned from your books as you don't like to be considered odd by your friends.
   (3) You try to divide your time better as you admit your friends may have some worthwhile pursuits too.

4. You promised a Y-leader you would come in Friday evening and help with one of the craft groups. You enjoy this type of work very much. You forgot about plans you had made with your friends to have a party that evening — dinner and then dancing. What would you do?
   (1) Go because the Y activities seem important in promoting the idea of brotherhood?
   (2) Go to the party because the gang is depending on you?
   (3) Go to the Y because you are able to express your own talents in group activity?

5. You are gifted musically and spend much time practicing. Your fellow dormitory residents urge you to join them more often in their leisure pursuits. What do you do?
   (1) Take more time to do things with others, because these friends may be important for your future life?
   (2) Be concerned primarily with developing your musical potentialities even if it means you are labeled as "different" and are less popular than you might be if you were more sociable?
   (3) Participate more with the group because in a democracy, group participation and cooperation are very important?

6. You are interested in taking up some form of athletics. Other things being equal, would you select tennis and squash, or handball and bowling?
   (1) Tennis and squash because you are likely to meet people somewhat higher in the conventional social scale?

(2) Handball and bowling because you would meet more different kinds of people?
(3) Choose on the basis of the ones which you think would keep you physically and psychologically fit in terms of interpersonal relationships?

7. Beach parties with your friends are becoming more liquor laden. You don't drink and you don't enjoy your friends when they are under the influence.
   (1) You continue to go along, though uncomfortable, as you can't afford to be an outsider.
   (2) You put your cards on the table and get your friends to include you when there is no liquor, and vice versa. No feelings.
   (3) You decide not to attend these parties because you feel you must be true to yourself.

8. You're losing at gambling.
   (1) You realize you are only hurting yourself so you stop gambling permanently.
   (2) You continue because it is important that your friends consider you a real sport.
   (3) You've announced your limit and your friends have agreed. You quit when the limit is reached, as agreed.

9. You've time for only one movie this month.
   (1) You see that Hollywood spectacular that everyone's talking about in order to be up to date.
   (2) You see the one everyone's talking about as you think what is commonly acclaimed is usually the right thing because of the basic good sense of the populace.
   (3) You see the unusual Japanese movie you've been anticipating for a long time.

10. You get a gift certificate from a record shop for your birthday. You're trying to decide what records you'll exchange it for.
   (1) You get an album of classics to impress your friends.
   (2) You get assorted jazz records as these satisfy your musical tastes.
   (3) You get some of each of the types your friends will enjoy.

IV. *Personal Problems on Dating, Marriage and Sex*

1. Your younger sister, Susan, is only thirteen. Your father says she is too young to go to the high school dance with the junior class president. Susan thinks this is unfair because her best friend is going and wants a double date. If you were her mother, what would you do?
   (1) Let her go because he comes from one of the best families?
   (2) Call a family conference and see if the family as a whole could arrive at a sound decision?
   (3) Let her go because it would be a growing experience for Susan?

2. You have been asked to go to the spring formal by two friends. The one you really like has little campus prestige and is not too popular. The other one is very popular and is really the campus "social idol." What would you do?

(1) Go with the one you really like?
(2) Go with the very popular one because of added prestige for you?
(3) Go with the one you liked because he asked you first?

3. You want to marry a person whose family your parents dislike. What would you do?
   (1) Make up your own mind?
   (2) Stop dating the person because you would be socially unacceptable to his (her) family and friends?
   (3) Try to get the two families to understand each other so that you can marry with parental approval?

4. If you were dating a person of another faith, and found you were falling in love, what would you do?
   (1) Break off the relationship because your friends and family consider an inter-religious marriage unwise socially?
   (2) Continue dating because you feel in a democracy the significance and worth of the individual is fundamental?
   (3) Continue dating because you love him (her) as an individual regardless of the difference in faith?

5. In what way would you prefer to impress your date?
   (1) As one who is in the "know" regarding restaurants, theatre, TV personalities?
   (2) As a person who is vitally interested in other people regardless of color, race, or creed?
   (3) As an independent person who wants to live the good life according to his own standards?

6. A fraternity (sorority) is holding a spring weekend outing at a University-owned retreat. What kind of date would you like to take?
   (1) A good looking, attractive person that would make others envious of you even though you might not have much in common?
   (2) Someone with a good personality who would stimulate you to do your best in the events of the weekend?
   (3) Someone whom you know will be able to contribute much to the success of the weekend for everyone?

7. You have been away to college and while there you meet a boy (girl) with whom you are now going steady. While home for the weekend, what would you emphasize in describing him (her) to your family?
   (1) As one who is liked by everyone?
   (2) As one whom you love more than anyone else?
   (3) As one who comes from one of the best families?

8. You are in college preparing to become an engineer. You fall in love, become engaged, and have to decide when to get married. What would you do?
   (1) Get married and find a way to finish school as well?
   (2) Postpone marriage until you finish your training and have enough money saved to start marriage on a sound financial basis, including owning a car, a house, etc.?
   (3) Talk it over with your fiance and come to a mutual decision?

9. You are in love but not ready, yet, to marry. Family, church, and cultural environment have given you and the one you love, standards of sex conduct which you now find are violently in conflict with your feelings. What can you do about it?
   (1) Seek some outside counsel whom you consider competent to help you both resolve the conflict.
   (2) Re-evaluate the standards by which you were brought up; then be guided by your own judgment even when (or if) it means overruling your previous sex standards.
   (3) Try to ignore your feelings. They have no business interfering with the orderly, step by step climb up the ladder to what you picture as your life.

10. You go for a ride with your friend and two other couples. When you stop in a "lover's lane area" the other couples begin the usual necking and love making. You are not against this sort of thing in private but oppose it in a crowd. What would you do?
   (1) Refuse absolutely to go along with the group.
   (2) Be a regular Joe and do what's expected of you.
   (3) Try to talk the group into continuing the ride or going to some place of amusement.

V. *Social Activities*

1. You have been chosen by your teachers and classmates to be awarded the D.A.R. Good Citizenship Certificate. You are gratified by the esteem of your supporters but you do not believe in some of the D.A.R.'s policies. What do you do?
   (1) Dismiss your misgivings and accept, as any honor helps your school record and its influence on college entrance, employment, etc.?
   (2) Make known to local school and D.A.R. authorities what your views are and get their reactions and suggestions before deciding definitely to accept or reject?
   (3) Stand by your personal beliefs and reject the honor?

2. Your group at school has been influential in the student government for more than two years now. Presently, a leader of another — a rival — group has been elected president. How do you feel about this?
   (1) Try in every way possible to get him out of office so that a member of your group may get back into power?
   (2) Assume that this new person has a lot to offer to your own development and work with him?
   (3) Feel that everyone has an equal right and let it go at that?

3. You are being pledged by several fraternities in your college. What would be your criterion for selecting one particular fraternity? Would your chosen fraternity be:
   (1) The one with the wealthiest and most influential student membership?
   (2) The one with the most gifted students, intellectually and otherwise?

(3) The one which is most democratic in its practices, welcoming membership from all economic, social, racial, and intellectual levels?

4. You are an editor of the University paper, writing a critical article on the campus parking problem. A high university official tells you not to print the article. What would you do?
   (1) Print it anyhow because you feel that what you have said is important?
   (2) Not print it because it might affect adversely the respect of your fraternity brothers?
   (3) Attempt to call a conference of editors and officials to discuss the problem?

5. As a joke you have been put up by your friends as a candidate for Student Council. You win. After a meeting or two, you find you want to take the job seriously even though your friends still think student government is a farce. What do you do?
   (1) To be considered cool, instead of square, by your friends, you take your new duties lightly and go along for laughs?
   (2) You make a special effort to get your friends to see the work in a new light and to cooperate with your efforts as a member of the Council?
   (3) You do your best at your new duties depending upon results to speak for themselves?

6. You are an honor student and an athletic leader in your school. You are asked to assume the presidency of your Student Council because you seem by far the most fitting candidate. You are not convinced that the latter is completely true. What do you do?
   (1) You accept the offer because it will probably help you to get a better job upon graduation?
   (2) You accept because it is a further challenge to you and may help you to further build your character and qualities of leadership?
   (3) You reject the offer because you feel that the office should be submitted to open election, allowing all those eligible an equal chance of winning?

7. You are a member of a club which has always been very exclusive. A person has just been accepted on the strength of his reputation, but no one had yet met this new member. At tonight's meeting you discover that he is of a different race. What do you do?
   (1) Try to get him to give up his membership because his presence tends to lower the club's status?
   (2) Make friends with him, try to understand him as a person and learn to like and to understand him?
   (3) Accept him, because democratic policy dictates that all are equal and should have equal rights?

8. Bill and John are running for the presidency of the student government. Bill is a good friend and a member of a very popular campus fraternity. You do not know John very well but you do know that he is a superior student and a very capable leader, though not a fraternity man. You are sure that John has the better qualifications for the presidency but

you hesitate to vote against your friend and the fraternity. What do you do?

(1) Vote for Bill because of his popularity and the fact that he is a good friend?

(2) Vote for John because you feel he will be able to do the most good for the entire student body?

(3) Vote for John because you believe the most capable person should be elected?

9. If you were invited to join a sorority (fraternity) or club which some of your friends were also planning to join, but which banned certain minority groups from membership, would you:

(1) Join because you want to be in the group with your friends?

(2) Not join because you think this exclusion of minority groups is too much against democratic ideals?

(3) Not join because you think this kind of restricted group does not recognize that each individual has some creative ability, no matter how different from others?

10. Your fraternity (sorority) made an excellent case for itself when you were pledged. Prolonged membership convinces you, however, that the case was a phony one. You feel the organization, as it now operates, is not worthy of support. What do you do?

(1) Since you're a member, you start to work from within to get members to take the organization's stated aims seriously and to live up to them.

(2) You assess the possibility of remaking the organization to your satisfaction. You quit, or you start remaking it, depending on whether you decide it's worth it to you.

(3) You try anything except quitting. Quitting this organization would affront too many people who might be in a position to do you some good.

PREVIOUS NUMBERS AVAILABLE

October, 1961. *Africa: A Bibliography with related Instructional aids for the Elementary and Secondary Schools.* Compiled by L. E. Tolman, et al. Postpaid, $1.00.

April. 1961. *Selected Graduate Student Papers in the Foundations of Education,* by Gene D. Phillips. Postpaid, $1.00.

February, 1961. *Automatic Teaching of Reading Skills in High School* by Mabel S. Noall. Postpaid $1.00.

December, 1960. *Teaching Topographical Orientation and Spatial Orientation to Congenitally Blind Children.* By Ralph J. Garry and Anna Ascarelli. Postpaid, $1.00.

October, 1960. *Education for Leisure* by James A. Wylie. Postpaid, $1.00.

April, 1960. *Some Neural and Glandular Bases of Learning* by Thomas H. Eames. Postpaid, $1.00.

February, 1960. *Character Education: Methods and Materials* by Ralph J. Garry. Postpaid, $1.00.

December, 1959. *Adapting Instruction to the Learning Needs of Children in the Intermediate Grades by* Donald D. Durrell, et al. Postpaid, $1.00.

October, 1959. *Enriching the Elementary School Mathematics Program for More Capable Children* by J. Fred Weaver and Cleo F. Brawley. Postpaid, $1.00.

April, 1959. *Basic Needs in Health Education* by Leslie W. Irwin. Postpaid, $1.00.

February, 1959. *Visual Handicaps to Reading* by Thomas H. Eames. Postpaid, $1.00.

December, 1958. *Today's Forecast for Science Education Tomorrow,* edited by John J. Read and Pearl A. Nelson. Postpaid, $1.00.

October, 1958. *Various Conceptions of the Role of the Educational Philosopher,* edited by Gene D. Phillips. Postpaid, $1.00.

April, 1958. *Preference Studies in Elementary Social Studies* by W. Linwood Chase and Gilbert M. Wilson.

February, 1958. *Success in First Grade Reading,* edited by Donald D. Durrell. Postpaid, $1.00.

December, 1957. *The Spontaneous Speaking Vocabulary of Children in Primary Grades* by Helen A. Murphy. Postpaid, $1.00.

April, 1957. *Guidance for the Classroom Teacher* by Dugald S. Arbuckle. Postpaid, $1.00.

February, 1957. *Can We Help Children to Write?* by B. Alice Crossley. Postpaid, $1.00.

December, 1956. *High Interest-Low Vocabulary Reading Materials* (a selected booklist) by Helen Blair Sullivan and Lorraine E. Tolman. Postpaid, $1.00.

April, 1956. *Forecasting Juvenile Delinquency* by William C. Kvaraceus. Postpaid, $1.00.

February, 1956. *Classroom Enrichment Through Pupil Specialties* by Donald D. Durrell and Leonard J. Savignano. Postpaid, $1.00.

December, 1955 *Adjusting to Individual Differences in English* by Olive S. Niles and Margaret J. Early. Postpaid, $1.00.